



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,024	04/08/2004	Daniel Conzelmann	A-3986	2444
24131	7590	07/18/2005	EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, PA			EVANS, ANDREA HENCE	
P O BOX 2480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			2854	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,024	CONZELMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea H. Evans	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 15-27 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15, 16, 18 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 17 and 19-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

**-FINAL REJECTION-**

***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 17 and 19-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Referring to claim 17, the prior art does not teach the method which further comprises providing the adjustable carriers of the sheet transport drum as swinging arms of coupler mechanisms.

Referring to claim 19, the prior art does not teach the method, which further comprises, during the drum conversion, guiding the drum circumferential shells with the adjustable carriers by moving the drum circumferential shells along the adjustable carriers and guiding the drum circumferential shells with the adjustable carriers during the movement.

Referring to claim 20, the prior art does not teach the method, which further comprises: disposing guides separately from the adjustable carriers on the sheet transport drum; and during the drum conversion, guiding the drum circumferential shells with the guides by moving the drum circumferential shells along the guides and guiding the drum circumferential shells with the guides.

Referring to claim 22, the prior art does not teach the method which further comprises, during the drum conversion, pushing the drum circumferential shells away from the sheet transport drum by rotational movements of the sheet transport drum.

Referring to claim 23, the prior art does not teach the method, which further comprises: holding the drum circumferential shells on the sheet transport drum in the first and second operating modes with holders; and during the drum conversion, automatically releasing the holders by a respective relative movement carried out between the sheet transport drum and at least one machine element separate from the sheet transport drum.

Claim 21 depends from 19.

Claim 24 depends from 23.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15,16,18,26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voge (5579691) in view of Pirie (2366930).

Referring to claims 15 and 27, Pirie teaches a method of operating a machine processing printing material sheets which comprises: providing a sheet transport drum (3) of the printing machine with drum circumferential shells (6,7); operating the sheet transport drum in various operating modes (See Column 5, lines 43-48; when the segments are ventilated and non-ventilated), in a first operating mode, fixing the drum circumferential shells (6,7) in an outer position (Figure 1, Column 4, lines 53-63) at a distance from an axis of rotation (see axis at 12) of the drum; in a second of the operating modes, fixing the drum circumferential shells in an

inner position on the sheet transport drum at a distance from the axis of rotation of the drum being less than the distance in the outer position (See Figure 2, Column 4, lines 64-67).

Voge teaches that the shells are detachable (See Column 5, lines 3-7). Voge does not specifically teach before a start of a third of the operating modes, removing the drum circumferential shells from the sheet transport drum during a drum conversion, and in the third operating mode, rotating the sheet transport drum without the drum circumferential shells. Pirie teaches removing the drum circumferential shells from the drum during a drum conversion to be carried out before the start of a third of the operating modes (mode 3-maintenance, See page 2, Column 1, lines 56-59). Pierre does not specifically state that the drum is rotated without the drum circumferential shells in the third operating mode. However, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate the drum in the third mode without the shells since Pirie teaches that in the prior art the cylinder can be used without the shell (See page 1, Column 1, lines 6-16).

Referring to claim 16, Voge teaches the method, which further comprises: providing the drum with adjustable carriers (air supply); and carrying the drum circumferential shells with adjustable carriers in the first and second operating modes. (See Column 4, lines 56-58).

Referring to claim 18, Voge teaches the method, which further comprises, during a change in an operating mode carried out between the first and second operating modes, adjusting each of the drum circumferential shells, together with a respective one of the adjustable carriers, into one of the inner and outer positions. (The shells are adjusted based on the air supply. See Column 2, lines 12-18).

Referring to claim 26, Voge does not teach in the third operating mode, rotating the sheet transport drum for maintenance. Pirie teaches the method which further comprises, in the third operating mode, rotating the sheet transport drum for maintenance. (See page 2, Column 1, lines 56-59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Voge such that in the third operating mode, the drum is rotated for maintenance so that the drum can be repaired without putting the repairer at risk as taught by Pirie.

5. Claim 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voge (5579691) in view of Pirie (2366930) and further in view of Helmstadter (6722276).

Referring to claim 25, Voge does not teach in the third operating mode, transporting the printing material sheets with the rotating sheet transport drum. Pierre does not specifically state that the drum is rotated without the drum circumferential shells in the third operating mode. However, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate the drum in the third mode without the shells since Pirie teaches that in the prior art the cylinder can be used without the shell (See page 1, Column 1, lines 6-16).

Pirie does not teach transporting material sheets with the rotating sheet transport drum. Helmstadter teaches the method which further comprises, transporting the printing material sheets with the rotating sheet transport drum. (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the drum to transport a sheet to afford proper handling of sheets in printing systems as taught by Helmstadter.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea H. Evans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2162. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea H. Evans, ESQ

AHE



Daniel J. Colilla  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2854